

Ohignal,

BRIAN C. MCNEIL EXECUTIVE SECRETARY

PEOEIVED

ARIZONA CORPORATION COMMISSION

OPEN MEETING ITEMPER HAR 14 P 12: 56

DATE:

WILLIAM A. MUNDELL

CHAIRMAN

JIM IRVIN COMMISSIONER MARC SPITZER COMMISSIONER

March 14, 2001

Arizona Corporation Commission 10N DOCKETNE DITROL

DOCKET NO:

T-03296A-96-0590

MAR 1 4 2001

TO ALL PARTIES:

DOCKETED BY MW

Enclosed please find the recommendation of Administrative Law Judge Alicia Grantham. The recommendation has been filed in the form of an Order on:

DANCRIS TELECOM, L.L.C. (RESELLER)

Pursuant to A.A.C. R14-3-110(B), you may file exceptions to the recommendation of the Administrative Law Judge by filing an original and ten (10) copies of the exceptions with the Commission's Docket Control at the address listed below by <u>4:00</u> p.m. on or before:

MARCH 23, 2001

The enclosed is <u>NOT</u> an order of the Commission, but a recommendation of the Administrative Law Judge to the Commissioners. Consideration of this matter has <u>tentatively</u> been scheduled for the Commission's Working Session and Open Meeting to be held on:

MARCH 27, 2001 and MARCH 28, 2001

For more information, you may contact Docket Control at (602)542-3477 or the Hearing Division at (602)542-4250.

BRIAN C. McNEIL

EXECUTIVE SECRETARY

1 BEFORE THE ARIZONA CORPORATION COMMISSION WILLIAM A. MUNDELL **CHAIRMAN** 3 JIM IRVIN COMMISSIONER 4 MARC SPITZER COMMISSIONER 5 IN THE MATTER OF THE APPLICATION OF DOCKET NO. T-03296A-96-0590 DANCRIS TELECOM, L.L.C. FOR A CERTIFICATE OF CONVENIENCE AND NECESSITY TO PROVIDE COMPETITIVE DECISION NO. RESOLD INTEREXCHANGE TELECOMMUNICATIONS SERVICES EXCEPT LOCAL EXCHANGE SERVICES **ORDER** 9 Open Meeting 10 March 27 and 28, 2001 Phoenix, Arizona 11 BY THE COMMISSION: 12 Having considered the entire record herein and being fully advised in the premises, the 13 Arizona Corporation Commission ("Commission") finds, concludes, and orders that: 14 **FINDINGS OF FACT** 15 1. On December 2, 1996 DanCris Telecom, L.L.C." or "Applicant") filed with the 16 Commission an application for a Certificate of Convenience and Necessity ("Certificate") to provide 17 competitive resold interexchange telecommunications services, except local exchange services within 18 the State of Arizona. 19 2. In Decision No. 58926 (December 22, 1994), the Commission found that resold 20 telecommunications providers ("resellers") were public service corporations subject to the 21 jurisdiction of the Commission. 22 3. Applicant is an Arizona limited liability company authorized to do business in 23 Arizona. 24 4. Applicant is a switchless reseller, which purchases telecommunications services from 25 various telecommunications service providers. 26 On February 18, 1997, Applicant filed Affidavits of Publication indicating compliance 5. 27 with the Commission's notice requirements. 28

1

S\h\ali\tel\or\960590or

- 6. On September 8, 2000, the Commission's Utilities Division Staff ("Staff") filed its Staff Report in this matter.
- 7. Staff stated that the Applicant provided its unaudited financial statements for the year ending December 31, 1999. These financial statements listed assets of \$2.3 million, negative shareholders' equity of \$614,992, and a net income of \$134,479 on revenues of \$10.1 million. Based on the foregoing, Staff believes that Applicant lacks adequate financial resources to be allowed to charge customers any prepayments, advances or deposits without establishing an escrow account or posting a surety bond. Since Applicant does not appear to have sufficient financial resources, it has docketed proof or a surety bond in the amount of \$5,000, which shall be in effect for a minimum of one year and will approximate the total amount of any prepayments, advances, or deposits that the Applicant collects from its customers.
- 8. The Staff Report stated that Applicant has no market power and the reasonableness of its rates would be evaluated in a market with numerous competitors.
 - 9. In its Report, Staff recommended the following:
 - (a) Applicant should be ordered to comply with all Commission rules, orders and other requirements relevant to the provision of intrastate telecommunications services;
 - (b) Applicant should be ordered to maintain its accounts and records as required by the Commission;
 - (c) Applicant should be ordered to file with the Commission all financial and other reports that the Commission may require, and in a form and at such times as the Commission may designate;
 - (d) Applicant should be ordered to maintain on file with the Commission all current tariffs and rates, and any service standards that the Commission may require;
 - (e) Applicant should be ordered to comply with the Commission's rules and modify its tariffs to conform to these rules if it is determined that there is a conflict between the Applicant's tariffs and the Commission's rules;
 - (f) Applicant should be ordered to cooperate with Commission investigations of customer complaints;
 - (g) Applicant should be ordered to participate in and contribute to a universal service fund, as required by the Commission;

- (h) Applicant should be ordered to notify the Commission immediately upon changes to the Applicant's address or telephone number;
- (i) Approval of the \$5,000 surety bond filed by Applicant to cover the approximate total amount of any prepayments, advances and deposits that Applicant will collect from its customers;
- (j) After one year of operation under the Certificate granted by the Commission, the Applicant should be allowed to file a request for cancellation of its established surety bond, and that such request be accompanied by information demonstrating the Applicant's financial viability. Upon receipt of such filing and after Staff review, Staff would forward its recommendation to the Commission for a Decision;
- (k) Applicant's intrastate interexchange service offerings should be classified as competitive pursuant to A.A.C. R14-2-1108;
- (1) The rates proposed by the Applicant in its most recently filed tariffs should be approved on an interim basis. The maximum rates for these services should be the maximum rates proposed by the Applicant in its proposed tariffs. The minimum rates for the Applicant's competitive services should be the Applicant's total service long run incremental costs of providing those services as set forth in A.A.C. R14-2-1109; and
- (m) In the event that the Applicant states only one rate in its proposed tariff for a competitive service, the rate stated should be the effective (actual) price to be charged for the service as well as the service's maximum rate.
- 10. On August 29, 2000, the Court of Appeals, Division One ("Court") issued its Opinion in <u>US WEST Communications, Inc. v. Arizona Corporation Commission</u>, 1 CA-CV 98-0672, holding that "the Arizona Constitution requires the Commission to determine fair value rate base ("FVRB") for all public service corporations in Arizona prior to setting their rates and charges."
- 11. On October 26, 2000, the Commission filed a Petition for Review to the Arizona Supreme Court. On February 13, 2001, the Commission's Petition was granted. However, at this time, we are going to request FVRB information to insure compliance with the Constitution should the ultimate decision of the Supreme Court affirm the Court's interpretation of Section 14. We are also concerned that the cost and complexity of FVRB determinations must not offend the Telecommunications Act of 1996.
- 12. No exceptions were filed to the Staff Report, nor did any party request that a hearing be held.

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

- 1. Applicant is a public service corporation within the meaning of Article XV of the Arizona Constitution and A.R.S. §§ 40-281 and 40-282.
- 2. The Commission has jurisdiction over Applicant and the subject matter of the application.
 - 3. Notice of the application was given in accordance with the law.
- 4. Applicant's provision of resold intrastate telecommunications services is in the public interest.
- 5. Applicant is a fit and proper entity to receive a Certificate for providing competitive intrastate telecommunications as a reseller in Arizona.
- 6. Staff's recommendations in Findings of Fact No. 9 are reasonable and should be adopted.

ORDER

IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that the application for DanCris Telecom, L.L.C. for a Certificate of Convenience and Necessity for authority to provide competitive resold interexchange telecommunications services, except local exchange services, shall be and the same is hereby granted.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that DanCris Telecom, L.L.C's surety bond in the amount of \$5,000 is hereby approved.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that DanCris Telecom, L.L.C. shall comply with the Staff recommendations set forth in Findings of Fact No. 9.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that DanCris Telecom, L.L.C. shall file the following FVRB information within 18 months of the date that it first provides service. The FVRB shall include a dollar amount representing the total revenue for the first twelve months of telecommunications service provided to Arizona customers DanCris Telecom, L.L.C. following certification, adjusted to reflect the maximum rates that DanCris Telecom, L.L.C. requests in its tariff. This adjusted total revenue figure could be calculated as the number of units sold for all services offered times the maximum charge per unit DanCris Telecom, L.L.C. shall also file FVRB information detailing the total actual operating expenses for the first twelve months of telecommunications service provided to

	•	
1	Arizona customers DanCris Telecon	m, L.L.C. following certification. DanCris Telecom, L.L.C. shall
2	also file FVRB information which	includes a description and value of all assets, including plant,
3	equipment, and office supplies, to	be used to provide telecommunications service to Arizona
4	customers for the first twelve month	s following DanCris Telecom, L.L.C.'s certification.
5	IT IS FURTHER ORDERE	ED that within 30 days of the effective date of this Decision,
6	DanCris Telecom, L.L.C. shall	notify the Compliance Section of the Arizona Corporation
7	Commission of the date that it will b	begin or has begun providing service to Arizona customers.
8	IT IS FURTHER ORDEREI	O that this Decision shall become effective immediately.
9	BY ORDER OF TH	IE ARIZONA CORPORATION COMMISSION.
10		
11		
12	CHAIRMAN	COMMISSIONER COMMISSIONER
13		
14		IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I, BRIAN C. McNEIL, Executive
15		Secretary of the Arizona Corporation Commission, have hereunto set my hand and caused the official seal of the
16		Commission to be affixed at the Capitol, in the City of Phoenix, this day of, 2001.
17		
18		BRIAN C. McNEIL
19		EXECUTIVE SECRETARY
20	DISSENT	
21	AG:mlj	
22		
23		
24		
2425		
25		
25 26		

DECISION NO.

. 1	SERVICE LIST FOR: DANCRIS TELECOM, L.L.C.	
2	T 0000 () 0 0 0 0 0 0	
3	DOCKET NO.: T-03296A-96-0590	
4	Mickey Rao	
5	DANCRIS TELECOM, L.L.C. 6900 East Camelback Road, Suite 1003	
6	Scottsdale, Arizona 82251	
7	Carey Roesel TECHNOLOGIES MANAGEMENT, INC.	
8	P.O. Drawer 200 Winter Park, Florida 32790	
9	Christopher Kempley, Chief Counsel	
10	Legal Division ARIZONA CORPORATION COMMISSION	
11	1200 West Washington Street Phoenix, Arizona 85007	
12	Deborah Scott, Director Utilities Division ARIZONA CORPORATION COMMISSION 1200 West Washington Street	
13		
14	Phoenix, Arizona 85007	
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		
. 26		
27		

DECISION NO.